

## PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-G

### PC-G1

**From:** Helga Gergens [hgergens@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 01, 2013 9:13 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS; Dad  
**Subject:** 405 Project-NO TOLLS!!!!

The HOV lanes should not be tolled. WE have paid over and over and over as tax payers for this project. To have the current administration put signs along your work "BROUGHT TO YOU BY THE MERICAN RECOVERY ACT" is maddening and makes me want to vomit on the side of the freeway each time I see it.. That statement might be true for future projects but not for this one. WE have paid for this project...no tolls required.

We paid for the CURRENT HOV lanes and they should not be tolled regardless of your expansion.

H.

} 1

### PC-G2

**From:** William R. Giser [bgiser@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 09, 2013 12:18 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Cc:** Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell  
**Subject:** 405 SDEIR –DEIS Comment Period

William R. Giser  
1949 N. Britton Dr.  
Long Beach, CA 90815-3266  
562 – 598 – 0416

Simita Deshpande – Branch Chief  
Caltrans – District 12  
2201 Dupont r., Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92612

RE: 405 SDEIR –DEIS Comment Period

Dear Ms Deshpande,

The City of Long Beach has had little to no input on the 405 Widening Project and now we are being told that Long Beach will be paying for a portion of the impacts created by this Orange County Project.

} 1

While, it is my understanding that Long Beach City Officials have been meeting on this project since 2009 and have had little cooperation from the Orange County Transportation Authority.

The City of Long Beach was informed through the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) that we would be held responsible for mitigation costs on our local streets and state owned right-of-ways, including 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

Long Beach City Traffic Engineer Dave Roseman believes there are millions of dollars worth of improvements to Long Beach intersections, which he believes will fall on Long Beach to pay for.

} 2

An alteration to any part of our state CALTRANS system automatically affects surrounding areas. I urge you work with our city officials to workout

PC-G2 Continued

a mutually acceptable agreement rather than what appears to be an autocratic fiat. } 2  
cont.

Let me thank you in advance,  
William R. Giser

CC: Senator Lou Correa  
Assembly Woman Bonnie Lowenthal  
Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell

**"Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored."**  
**Aldous Huxley**

PC-G3

From: Susan Graham [suegraham024@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 6:53 AM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

I am very disappointed that Caltrans is once again trying to change the 405 plan. The cities and residents most affected with the changes expressed their concerns last year and were pleased with the decision at that time. I think most of us would have been happy with adding two general purpose lanes in each direction (no toll lanes), but we were OK with the one lane in each direction that you put in place. Now we find that you are reconsidering. Part of what you are planning involves tearing down the Fairview Road bridge that you just several years ago spent millions of dollars to upgrade. We went through many months of the reconstruction of that and we certainly don't want to go through that again. You think nothing of throwing away those millions of dollars that we taxpayers spent. Can you understand why taxpayers are so disgusted with the wasteful spending of our government? }

What makes you think that any of us have changed our minds about the project? Please keep the addition of one lane in each direction, or changing to the 2 general purpose lanes and may I emphasize NO TOLL LANES and no re-doing the Fairview bridge.

Sue Graham  
1106 Redding Ave.  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

PC-G4

From: David Gray [drdj.gray@verizon.net]  
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:04 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

In reviewing the suggested solution to manage anticipated increased traffic with installation of a traffic signal, I have significant and I would suggest an alternative solution. My concern is that the cueing system with two lanes approaching the traffic signal will not suffice, and traffic will back-up on 7<sup>th</sup> street and towards the freeway. In addition, we will lose our free right turn out of the track which works very well at this time. Consider expanding the number of lanes, including a College Pk only lane heading West going into College Park Drive from the 7<sup>th</sup> street exit to Studebaker. Keeping the our right turn lane out of College Pk West also free flowing without a signal. To accommodate this, add one additional lane off 7<sup>th</sup> street exit to Studebaker. The signal could be kept only for those turning left out of the track, or turning left into the track. This would increase car capacity cuing and reduce the number of cars planning to enter College Park from adding to this cue line. }

David Gray  
176 College Pk Dr  
Seal Beach  
562-596-3000

PC-G5

6/26/2012

As an original owner I  
request that CPE be left alone.  
The wall should be left intact as  
it serves as a form of protection  
for residents.

As the freeway has now been  
expanded it has created more  
accidents and further expansion  
would only serve to be more  
detrimental.

Please consider the residents  
and air quality of the entire  
community.

Travis Greene  
4356 Dogwood Ave  
Seal Beach 90740

1

PC-G6

From: Travis Greene [travisgreene@juno.com]  
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 12:17 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

As requested, I'll offer my two cents on this EIR/EIS. Traffic is undoubtedly a major problem for the area. I used to commute from Seal Beach (I live in College Park East) to Irvine for work five days a week, and what takes 25 minutes without traffic could easily take over an hour with typical traffic. Today I work from home and only commute to the airports (typically LAX) for travel (twice a month, on average). Perhaps the future will include more information workers like me working remotely, but there are many jobs that can't be performed remotely, particularly blue-collar, manufacturing and service-sector jobs. For those workers, they need real solutions, not high-cost toll lanes or carpool/HOV lanes, which might feel good from an environmental standpoint but are typically jammed up when you need them and useless when traffic is flowing because there are no open times for those lanes and huge double-yellow line sections that make it inconvenient to exit.

1

I would urge strong consideration of plans that add general-purpose lanes only. Californians pay far more in gas taxes to support our roads than most other states. We should get a return on that investment that is not intended for elites only.

Travis Greene  
4356 Dogwood Ave  
Seal Beach, CA 90740

PC-G7

From: Steve Grenier [steve14128@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 7:32 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

I have major concerns regarding this expansion project. It is very obvious that this will severely impact our property values and our quality of life. Since the southbound widening of the 405 has been rejected because of business closures, it is apparent that the northbound widening should be rejected because of the impact it will have on our homes and families.

1

Thank you for listening and for giving this matter serious consideration.

Steve and Pat Grenier  
9066 Wendy Circle  
Fountain Valley, CA, 92708

## **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-G**

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-G1**

#### **Comment PC-G1-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-G2**

#### **Comment PC-G2-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

There has been substantial coordination with the City of Long Beach, which is a formal Participating Agency under NEPA. For more details on the extent of coordination with the City of Long Beach, see Appendix R1 Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, Gateway City Council of Governments, and the City of Long Beach.

#### **Comment PC-G2-2**

A fair share of the costs for the improvements proposed in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS under Measure T-10 would address cumulative significant impacts to traffic on SR-22 (7<sup>th</sup> Street), which is a State highway. This fair share would be contributed by the I-405 Improvement Project for the proposed improvements. The remainder of the funding would be the responsibility of the State, not the City of Long Beach.

A comparison of the volumes at intersections along 7<sup>th</sup> Street under the existing condition (Figure 3-5 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS) with the forecast volumes for the 2040 No Build Alternative (Figure 3-18 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS) shows that traffic is anticipated to increase along 7<sup>th</sup> Street without the proposed I-405 Improvement Project. Consequently, there is

an adverse effect on 7<sup>th</sup> Street traffic without the project. The additional increment of traffic on 7<sup>th</sup> Street associated with the proposed project results in cumulative effects of traffic from the project and from other sources that are greater than those solely from the project alone. Consequently, the measures included in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are not intended to address all of the deterioration in traffic service expected between the existing condition and year 2040.

A fair share of the costs for the improvements proposed in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS under Measure T-11 would address cumulative significant impacts to traffic on streets owned by the City of Long Beach. The remainder of the funding at these locations would be the responsibility of the City of Long Beach.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-G3**

#### **Comment PC-G3-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

As discussed on page S-1 of the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS, the supplemental document provides new information on potential project-related traffic effects within Long Beach. The new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS is based on the *Supplemental Traffic Study Report – Long Beach Area* (Supplemental Traffic Study), prepared in March 2013 in response to City of Long Beach comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. The information and analysis within this Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS was not available during the circulation period for the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed alternatives in the June 2013 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS are identical to the alternatives in the Draft May 2012 Draft EIR/EIS.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Replacement of Fairview Road Overcrossing/Truncation of Tolled Express Lanes, Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-G4**

#### **Comment PC-G4-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comments on new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS were considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative

as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Analysis of the proposed improvements at the intersection of College Park Drive and the SR-22 westbound ramps is presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. The analysis shows that the queues would not back up onto the SR-22 westbound freeway. The following table presents the anticipated queues; the data are presented in the Supplemental Traffic Study Report – Long Beach Area in Appendices III A-1, III A-2, IV A-1, and IV A-2 for Alternative 1 year 2020, Alternative 1 year 2040, Alternative 2 year 2020, and Alternative 2 year 2040, respectively. The table shows that the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues anticipated approaching the intersection with the proposed signal would not exceed 240 feet during the peak hours in the years 2020 and 2040. The distance from the stop line for the proposed signal at the intersection of the ramp with College Park Drive to the gore point is approximately 850 feet.

<b>Anticipated 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile Queues on the SR-22 Westbound Exit Ramp Approach to the Proposed Signal at College Park Drive</b>			
		<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>
2020	AM	142	148
	PM	223	240
2040	AM	160	189
	PM	226	240

The analysis presented in the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS in Tables 3-9 and 3-11 shows that the proposed signal will operate at LOS B or C in the peak hours in 2020 and 2040.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-G5**

#### **Comment PC-G5-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Wall, Air Quality, Health Risks.

## **Response to Comment Letter PC-G6**

### **Comment PC-G6-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.

## **Response to Comment Letter PC-G7**

### **Comment PC-G7-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Property Values, Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange.

This page intentionally left blank.